

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 RYAN PETERSEN, MICHAEL P. PETERSEN,
11 and RANDI PETERSEN

No. C 12-3607 SI

12 Plaintiffs,

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFFS' APRIL 15,
2013 FILING**

13 v.

14 MILDRED BROWNE, *et al.*,

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 On April 15, 2013, plaintiffs filed a "Clarification Declaration of Randi Petersen." Dkt. 62.
18 Earlier that same day, the Court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the first amended complaint and
19 entered judgment against plaintiffs. Dkts. 58, 59. Ms. Petersen's declaration states, *inter alia*, that
20 "PLAINTIFFS believe the facts of this case appear to invalidate the Court's 1/16/13 *res judicata*
21 dismissal" Dkt. 62 at 2:3-4. In an order filed January 16, 2013, the Court dismissed many of
22 plaintiffs' claims as barred by *res judicata*, for not stating a cause of action, or as incomprehensible, and
23 granted leave to amend the RICO claim. Dkt. 43. In an order filed March 6, 2013, the Court denied
24 plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration of the January 16, 2013 order. Dkt. 54.

25 The April 15, 2013 declaration repeats the same arguments plaintiffs have raised throughout this
26 lawsuit. To the extent the April 15, 2013 declaration is construed as a motion for reconsideration of the
27 January 16, 2013 order, the motion is DENIED for the reasons set forth in the March 6, 2013 order. To
28 the extent the declaration was filed in opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss the first amended

1 complaint, the declaration is untimely. Finally, to the extent the April 15, 2013 filing is construed as
2 a motion to alter or amend the Court's judgment entered earlier that day, the motion is DENIED.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: April 18, 2013



6 SUSAN ILLSTON
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28